

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the present amendment, one (1) claim is amended, fifty-two (52) claims are cancelled, and twenty four (24) dependent claims are added. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter has been added and no change in inventorship is believed to result from the amendments proposed herein. No fees for claims are believed payable.

The amendments proposed herein are made solely to expedite prosecution of various embodiments of the invention. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute one or more cancelled claims or any subject matter enabled by the instant specification in one or more continuing applications.

Support for amended claim 55 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 7, lines 19-24 and page 18, lines 5 – 18.

Support for new claim 108 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 17 – 22.

Support for new claim 109 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19-21.

Support for new claim 110 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19 - 21.

Support for new claim 111 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19 - 21.

Support for new claim 112 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19 - 21.

Support for new claim 113 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19 - 21.

Support for new claim 114 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19 - 22.

Support for new claim 115 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 16, lines 19 - 22.

Support for new claim 116 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, line 14 – 16.

Support for new claim 117 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 118 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 119 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 120 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 121 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 122 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 123 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, lines 1 – 6.

Support for new claim 124 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 17, line 11.

Support for new claim 125 can be found in the specification as filed at original claims 57 - 106.

Support for new claim 126 can be found in the specification as filed at original claim 64.

Support for new claim 127 can be found in the specification as filed at original claim 65.

Support for new claim 128 can be found in the specification as filed at original claim 66.

Support for new claim 129 can be found in the specification as filed at page 17, lines 12 – 14.

Support for new claim 130 can be found in the specification as filed at page 8, lines 29 – 34.

Support for new claim 131 can be found in the specification as filed at page 8, lines 29 – 34.

Support for new claim 132 can be found in the specification as filed at page 8, lines 29 – 34.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION DATED AUGUST 22, 2006

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6734154.

Claims 55-108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6734154 (“Flynn”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. That is, the hypothetical person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, must have had a reasonable expectation that the proposed modification or combination would work to produce beneficial results. Finally, the references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See MPEP § 2143.* The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness lies with the Examiner, and both the suggestion and the expectation of success must be found in the prior art, not the applicant’s disclosure.” *In re Dow Chemical*, 5 USPQ 2d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

As will be discussed in detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that in the instant case, each and every limitation of the instant claimed invention is not disclosed in Flynn. Therefore, Applicant submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom require, *inter alia*, “a pressurizable drying vessel adapted to hold cleaned substrates and pressurized fluid solvent...” This limitation is not disclosed in Flynn. The Examiner implies that Flynn’s disclosure of a forced air convection dryer meets the limitation in question. However, a conventional forced air convection dryer is not a pressurizable drying vessel adapted to hold pressurized fluid solvent.

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom also require, *inter alia*, a pressurized fluid solvent tank. This feature is not disclosed in Flynn.

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom also require, *inter alia*, a non-pressurizable cleaning vessel adapted to hold contaminated substrates and organic solvent. This limitation is not disclosed in Flynn.

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom also require, *inter alia*, “a pump for pumping organic solvent” and “a pump for pumping pressurized fluid solvent”. Neither of these elements is disclosed in Flynn.

For at least the foregoing reasons, each and every element of Applicant’s claims is not disclosed in Flynn. As such, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. 6,344,243.

Claims 55 – 108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,344,243 (“DeYoung”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As will be discussed in detail below, Applicants submit that in the instant case, each and every limitation of the instant claimed invention is not disclosed in DeYoung. Therefore, Applicant submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom require, *inter alia*, “a non-pressurizable cleaning vessel adapted to hold contaminated substrates and organic solvent”. This element is not disclosed in DeYoung. DeYoung only discloses a pressurized vessel (Col. 8, line 64).

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom require, *inter alia*, “a pump or compressor for moving organic solvent from the organic solvent tank to the cleaning vessel”. This element is not disclosed in DeYoung.

Claim 55 and those claims depending therefrom require, *inter alia*, “a pump or compressor for moving pressurized fluid solvent from the organic solvent tank to the drying vessel”. This element is not disclosed in DeYoung. The Examiner sites a passage at Column 9, lines 50-54 of DeYoung, but the cited passage does not disclose the claimed element. The cited passage discloses that carbon dioxide fluid can be pumped *away from* a substrate vessel by means such as pumping. This passage does not disclose “a pump for pumping pressurized fluid solvent from the pressurized fluid solvent tank *to* the drying vessel.” (emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing reasons, each and every element of Applicant’s claims is not disclosed in DeYoung. As such, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Flynn or DeYoung and further in view of U.S. 5,943,721.

Claims 55 – 108 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flynn or DeYoung and further in view of U.S. 5,943,721 (“LeBlanc”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As will be discussed in detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that each and every limitation of the instant claimed invention is not disclosed in any combination of Flynn, DeYoung or LeBlanc. Therefore, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established.

Flynn and DeYoung are discussed above. Flynn and DeYoung fail to disclose several elements of the claimed invention. LeBlanc does not cure these defects.

For example, none of Flynn, DeYoung or LeBlanc discloses a non-pressurizable cleaning vessel adapted to hold contaminated substrates and organic solvent. Flynn is silent as to vessels, and DeYoung and LeBlanc only disclose pressurized vessels (DeYoung: Col. 8, line 64; “in an appropriate pressurized system (e.g. vessel)”; LeBlanc: Col. 3, lines 4-5; “the wash vessel is a pressure vessel...”).

Further, none of Flynn, DeYoung or LeBlanc discloses an organic solvent tank operatively connected to a non-pressurizable cleaning vessel. Again, Flynn is silent as to vessels, and DeYoung and LeBlanc only disclose pressurized vessels.

Additionally, none of Flynn, DeYoung or LeBlanc discloses a pump or compressor for moving organic solvent from an organic solvent tank to a cleaning vessel.

For at least the foregoing reasons, each and every element of Applicant’s claims are not disclosed in Flynn, DeYoung and LeBlanc. As such, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
By:
HOWREY, LLP



David B. Fournier
Reg. No. 51,696

CUSTOMER NUMBER 22930

HOWREY, LLP

2941 Fairview Park Dr., Suite 200
Falls Church, VA 22042-9922
Telephone: (312) 846-5621
Facsimile: (312) 264-0366